



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/950,902	10/15/1997	YOSHIHIDE HAGIWARA	S-2418	9924

7590 04/19/2002

SHERMAN & SHALLOWAY
413 NORTH WASHINGTON STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

SHERRER, CURTIS EDWARD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1761

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2002

23

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

T.D-23

Interview Summary	Application No. 08/950,902	Applicant(s) Hagiwara	
	Examiner Curtis E. Sherrer	Group Art Unit 1761	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Curtis E. Sherrer (3) _____
 (2) Larry Miller, Reg. #30,339 (4) _____

Date of Interview Apr 18, 2002

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: All claims in general, specifically, claim 1

Identification of prior art discussed:
Papazian and Rizzi et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant will consider submitting an amended claim 1 (see attached version of claim 1). The Examiner finds said amended claim 1 acceptable to overcome the standing 112 rejection and does not raise any new 112 rejections.
Applicant will consider presenting further arguments as to the patentability of the claimed invention over the prior art, e.g., there are significant patentable distinctions between the prior art and the invention and that there is no motivation to combine the cited art. Will consider discussing the unexpected results as found in the specification.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached



**CURTIS E. SHERRER
 PRIMARY EXAMINER
 ART UNIT 1761**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

MARKED-UP VERSION OF AMENDED CLAIM

Claim 1. (Thrice amended) A process for the [re-production of coffee flavor]
production of an alcoholic drink having coffee flavor from an extraction residue of
roasted coffee beans, which comprises adding a saccharide to an extraction residue of
roasted coffee beans and fermenting the resulting mixture in the presence of wine yeast
for the brewing of alcoholic wine liquors.